04.01-06/23/94-01117

(804) 322-4793

5090

1823:LGB:srw

JUN 23 1994

CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV Waste Management Division Attn: Ms. Gena Townsend 345 Courtland Street, N.E. Atlanta, Georgia 30365

Re: Draft Final Feasibility Study Report (FS), Proposed Remedial Action Plan (PRAP), and Record of Decision (ROD) Operable Unit No. 1 (Sites 21, 24, 78) MCB, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina

· 通知公司的提供 () 维建(

i indibalar

Dear Ms. Townsend:

Enclosed please find responses to USEPA comments received on the FS Report dated March 2 and 18, 1994, the PRAP dated March 17, 1994, and the ROD dated March 23, 1994. Any questions concerning these responses should be directed to Ms. Linda Berry who may be reached at (804) 322-4793.

Sincerely,

L. A. BOUCHER, P.E. Head Installation Restoration Section (South) Environmental Programs Branch Environmental Quality Division By direction of the Commander

Enclosure

Copy to: (w/encl)
NC DEHNR (Mr. Patrick Watters)
MCB Camp Lejeune (Mr. Neal Paul)
Baker Environmental (Mr. Ray Wattras)
Blind copy to:
1823 (LGB) 2 copies w/encls)
185
f:\home\berrylg\oul\dfepaco.doc

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY USEPA REGION IV ON THE DRAFT FS REPORT FOR OPERABLE UNIT 5 (SITE 2) MARINE CORPS BASE, CAMP LEJEUNE

de casa in that

anvienti.

I. Comment Letter Dated January 24, 1994

General Comments

- Two additional shallow monitoring wells have been installed on site. The Navy Contractor discussed the well locations with Ms. Gena Townsend A second round of groundwater samples was collected, inc. This second round of data has been incorporated into the RI Report.
- 2. The FS has been revised in response to this comment. Two times the average background concentrations will be utilized. The Navy, however, has reservations regarding this approach. This is due to the statistically insignificant number (six) of background samples available to calculate an average.

Specific Comments

- 1. A list of acronyms will be included after the Table of Contents.
- 2. The discrepancies between Tables ES-1 and 2-7 have been corrected.
- 3. The "J" qualifier description will be added to the footnotes of Tables ES-1 and 2-7. The inconsistencies between these two tables will be addressed.
- 4. Chromium was not retained as a COPC because it was detected only once at a concentration of 75 μg/L, which is greater than the North Carolina WQS of 50 μg/L, but less than the Federal MCL of 100 μg/L. Lead was not retained because it was detected (in 2GW01) at 15.5J μg/L, which is just above Federal MCL of 15 μg/L. Lead was also detected at a concentration of 27.2J μg/L in well 2 GW09. However, this well is considered a background well.
 - As noted in the response to General Comment No. 1, additional monitoring wells have been installed at the site.
- 5. The last paragraph of Section 1.0 (page 1-3) has been revised to indicate that confirmatory sampling must be performed to demonstrate that no human health or ecological risks remain after the TCRA. This requirement will also be incorporated into the Technical Specifications for the TCRA.
- 6. As noted in the response to General Comment No. 1, additional monitoring wells have been

installed at the site.

7. Monitoring wells 2GW7 and 2GW4 are located downgradient of monitoring well 2GW3.

naniesate

- 8. A description of the reasoning used to determine the size of the areas to be included in the TCRA was presented in Section 1.3.2. This section has been revised based on the preliminary design work completed for the TCRA.
- 9. Tables 1-2 through 1-16 have been revised using twice the base specific average background concentrations. In addition, Tables 1-2 and 1-4 list inorganic contaminants detected in the Lawn and Mixing Pad Areas, which will be remediated through the TCRA. Therefore, these inorganic contaminants will be removed.
- 10. The BTEX reference on Table 1-7,page 1-21, will be revised to TEX, which agrees with the contaminants listed (i.e., toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene).
- 11. The units on Tables 1-16 and 1-17 will be corrected to milligrams per kilogram.
- 12. See response to General Comment No. 1.
- 13. The text has been revised in response to this comment. The text describes the impact of these activities on the cost estimate.
- 14. The text has been revised in response to this comment. The distinctions between SVE and air sparging are noted.

II. Comment letter dated February 8, 1994

- 1. The text has been revised in response to this comment.
- 2. The table has been revised in response to this comment.
- 3. The tables have been revised in response to this comment. For groundwater, a PC of 1.0 is utilized in accounting for the amount absorbed via the dermal route of exposure.

212 484 212

PS Form **3800**, June 1991

		Posiman or Date
	\$	TOTAL Postage & Facs
		Return indicipt Showing to Whom Date, and Addressed's Eddress
		Betotti flest egit Minaving to Whoor & Date Description
		Mostle tel Deisery Free
		Auch sic Dollwer Fee
		Lestfedrage
	\$	f. istay.
	5	ATLANTA GA 30365
	T NE	345 COURTLAND ST
		MS GENA TOWNSEND
GCY	PROTECT A	US ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECT AGGY
-		

Receipt for

Certified Mail

No Insurance Coverage Provided
Do not use for International Mail
(See Reverse)

*

on the reverse side?	 SENDER: Complete items 1 and/or 2 for additional services. Complete items 3, and 4a & b. Print your name and address on the reverse of this form so the return this card to you. Attach this form to the front of the mailpiece, or on the back does not permit. Write "Return Receipt Requested" on the mailpiece below the ar The Return Receipt will show to whom the article was delivered delivered. 	if space 1. And Addressee's Address ticle number. 2. Restricted Delivery and the date Consult postmaster for fee.
ur RETURN ADDRESS completed		4a. Afficie Number P 212 484 542 4b. Service Type Registered Insured XX Certified COD Express Mail Return Receipt for Merchandise 7. Date of Delivery
		8. Addressee's Address (Only if requested and fee is paid)